## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHRISTINE HILL, individually and :

on behalf of all others similarly situated, : CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiffs,

:

**v.** 

FLAGSTAR BANK, et al., : No. 12-2770

Defendants. :

## **ORDER**

AND NOW, this 26<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2014, upon consideration of Genworth

Mortgage Insurance Corporation's Motion for Summary Judgment, Motion of Defendants

Flagstar Bank, FSB and Flagstar Reinsurance Company ("Flagstar") for Summary Judgment,

Plaintiffs' Consolidation Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motions for

Summary Judgment, and Flagstar's reply, and for the reasons provided in this Court's

Memorandum dated June 26, 2014, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 1. Genworth's motion (Document No. 94) is **GRANTED**.
- 2. Flagstar's motion (Document No. 98) is **GRANTED**.
- 3. Genworth's Motion to Exceed Page Limitation in Submitting its Reply in Further Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 114) is **DENIED**as moot.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs filed a response to this motion, arguing that Genworth's proposed reply brief exceeded the Court's page limits. The Court has sufficient briefing to decide Genworth's summary judgment motion without a reply brief. The Court did not consider Genworth's proposed reply brief in reaching its decision.

4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

BY THE COURT:

Berle M. Schiller, J.